



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,871	02/12/2004	Shaibal Roy	ID-494 (80215)	6107
89137	7590	09/07/2010	EXAMINER	
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath & Gilchrist - RIM 255 S. Orange Avenue Suite 1401 Orlando, FL 32801			BHATIA, AJAY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2445	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

creganoa@addmg.com  
portfolioipprosecution@rim.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/777,871	ROY, SHAIBAL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	AJAY BHATIA	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2010.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In light of applicant's amendment to the claims and applicant arguing the newly added claims examiner has provided a new grounds of rejection below. Additionally examiner is not persuaded by applicant's cursory traversal of the 103 motivation statement.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 29-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The present invention is directed to a computer-readable medium, which may include a carrier wave. Therefore the addition of "non-transitory" to overcome the rejection is necessary.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 9-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoglund, (United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0026513) in view of

Horstmann et al. (United States Patent 6,779,022) in further view of Bern (United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0009986).

For claim 1, Hoglund teaches, a communications system comprising:

    a plurality of mobile wireless communications devices each comprising a respective software client using at least one of a plurality of different operating protocols as configuration commands and instructions for accessing electronic mail (email) and to send at least one access request; (Hoglund, paragraph 65 RF/NCP, paragraph 36, automatic poll, POP and IMAP)

    a plurality of email data storage devices for storing email data files, each email data file being associated with a respective mobile wireless communications device, each email data file having a unique identification (UID) associated therewith, and each email data storage device using at least one of the plurality of different operating protocols; (Hoglund, paragraph 35, POP and IMAP, paragraph 91, message id, unique, paragraph 93, POP, IMAP)

    and a protocol interface device comprising

        a protocol converter module for communicating with the respective software client of each of said plurality of mobile wireless communications devices using respective operating protocols thereof, and (paragraph 87, proxy architecture, works with POP and IMAP, paragraph 936, interprets, paragraphs 104-106, worker threads, figure 6B)

a protocol engine module for communicating with said plurality of email data storage devices using respective operating protocols thereof, (Hoglund, paragraph 35, pop and imap, paragraphs 104-106, protocol identifier)

said protocol engine module also for initiating polling of said email data storage devices for UIDs of email data files stored thereon to maintain a UID list, (Hoglund, figure 8a, messages, paragraphs 90-91, messages ids, paragraph 107-109, raw message queue, compare those IDs with the IDs of message that have already been downloaded)

and for cooperating with said protocol converter module to provide the UID list to the respective software client of each of said plurality of mobile wireless communications devices upon receiving access requests therefrom, (Hoglund, paragraph 91, message ID, paragraphs 92-93, notified to transmit message to designated wireless device, paragraph 69, customers)

said protocol engine module also initiating polling (Hoglund, paragraph 96, automatically, every 30 minutes)

Hoglund, fails to clearly disclose, without initiated configuration commands and instructions from said software client thereof, and irrespective of communications with said given mobile wireless communication device.

Horstmann teaches, without initiated configuration commands and instructions from said software client thereof, and irrespective of communications with said given mobile wireless communication device. (Horstmann, Col. 4 lines 18-45, Mail poller, periodically)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Hoglund and Horstmann, by replacing Hoglund poller with that of Horstmann, because Horstmann, provides the added advantage of pushing through a firewall. (Horstmann, Col. 3 lines 48-50).

Hoglund-Horstmann fails to clearly disclose, the UID list being provided by the protocol engine module independent of respective ones of the email data files

Bern teaches, the UID list being provided by the protocol engine module independent of respective ones of the email data files (Bern, paragraphs 12, 14, 16, 18, UID list)

Hoglund, Horstmann and Bern are compatible.

Hoglund, Horstmann and Bern are in the email arts.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to replace send the entire message of Horstmann with that of

sending a smaller message of Bern, because the message of Bern could be more efficiently. (Bern, paragraph 14)

For claim 2, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim 1 wherein said protocol engine module detects new email data files stored on said email data storage devices based upon UIDs thereof, and wherein said protocol engine module cooperates with said protocol converter module to send alert notifications to respective mobile wireless communications devices upon detecting new email data files therefor. (Hoglund, paragraph 91, message ID, paragraphs 92-93, notified to transmit message to designated wireless device)

For claim 3, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim 1 wherein said protocol interface device further comprises a memory coupled to said protocol engine module for storing the UIDs. (Hoglund, paragraph 91, compare IDs)

For claim 4, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim 1 wherein said protocol engine module polls said email data storage devices only for UIDs. (Hoglund, paragraph 91, compare IDs)

For claim 5, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim 1 wherein said protocol engine module polls said email data storage devices based upon a static polling interval. (Hoglund, paragraph 96, 30 min)

For claim 6, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim i wherein said protocol engine module polls said email data storage devices based upon an adaptive polling interval. (Hoglund, paragraph 81, adaptive to schedule, paragraph 47, realtime)

For claim 7, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications device of Claim 1 wherein said protocol converter module and said protocol engine module communicate using a common interface protocol able to represent a desired number of protocol-supported elements for a desired operating protocol. (Hoglund, paragraph 104-106, POP, IMAP)

For claim 9, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim 1 wherein said plurality of email data storage devices, said plurality of wireless mobile communications devices, and said protocol interface device process email messages. (Hoglund, paragraph 43, email)

For claim 10, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim 1 further comprising a wide area network (WAN) connecting at least one of said wireless

mobile communications devices with said protocol interface device. (Hoglund, paragraph 65, roam across country)

For claim 11, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern teaches, the communications system of Claim 1 further comprising a wide area network (WAN) connecting at least one of said email data storage devices with said protocol interface device. (Hoglund, paragraphs 71-73, internet)

Claims 12-33 list all the same elements of claims 1-7 and 9-11. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-7 and 9-11, applies equally as well to claims 12-33.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern in view of Hopmann et al. (US Patent 6,578,069).

For claim 8, Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern fails to clearly disclose, the communications system of claim 7 wherein the common interface protocol is based upon a Web-based distributed authoring and versioning (WebDAV) protocol.

Hopmann teaches, the communications system of claim 7 wherein the common interface protocol is based upon a Web-based distributed authoring and versioning (WebDAV) protocol. (Hopmann, Col. 10 lines 25-37, webdav)

Hopmann and Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern are both in field of invention preventing duplicate downloads (Hopmann, Col. 2 line 37) and (Hoglund, paragraph 90)

Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern and Hopmann both utilize UID to track document making both systems compatible

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Hoglund-Horstmann-Bern with Hopmann, by adding the support for the WebDav protocol. because Hopmann provided the added benefit of being able to track changes when disconnected from the network and connected to a different server. (Hopmann, Col. 2 line 65 to line 3 line 7)

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Notice of references cited (if appropriate).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AJAY BHATIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, H, F 9:00-3:30, Also please fax interview requests to 571-273-3906.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571)272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ajay Bhatia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445